

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

---

RAJ PLASTIC SURGERY, LLC, *et al.*

Plaintiffs,

vs.

KELLY RAJ, *et al.*

Defendants.

---

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

Case No. 1:20-CV-00751

OPINION & ORDER  
[Resolving Doc No. [14](#)]

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On June 18, 2020, Defendant Kelly Raj moved to strike portions of the Complaint or seal Exhibit G.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs opposed.<sup>2</sup> With their opposition brief, Plaintiffs filed Exhibit 6, a document from Plaintiff Joyesh Raj and Defendant's state-court divorce proceeding. Defendant Kelly Raj now seeks to strike or seal the opposition brief's Exhibit 6.<sup>3</sup> Defendant argues that the divorce-proceeding filing contains "highly sensitive personal identifying information."<sup>4</sup>

There is a "strong presumption in favor of openness" of court records.<sup>5</sup> "Only the most compelling reasons can justify non-disclosure of judicial records."<sup>6</sup> The burden of overcoming that presumption is borne by the party that seeks to seal the records.<sup>7</sup> This party must show that "disclosure will work a clearly defined and serious injury."<sup>8</sup> Only

---

<sup>1</sup> Doc. [10](#).

<sup>2</sup> Doc. [13](#).

<sup>3</sup> Doc. [14](#). Plaintiff opposes the motion. Doc. [15](#). Defendant replied. Doc. [16](#).

<sup>4</sup> Doc. [14](#) at 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Shane Grp., Inc. v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Mich.*, 825 F.3d 299, 305 (6th Cir. 2016) (citing *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. F.T.C.*, 710 F.2d 1165, 1179 (6th Cir. 1983)).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* (citing *In re Knoxville News-Sentinel Co.*, 723 F.2d 470, 476 (6th Cir. 1983)).

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 307 (citing *In re Cedent Corp.*, 260 F.3d 183 at 194 (3d Cir. 2001)).

Case No.1:20-cv-00751  
Gwin, J.

“trade secrets, information covered by a recognized privilege . . . and information required by statute to be maintained in confidence . . .’ is typically enough to overcome the presumption of access.”<sup>9</sup>

Defendant has not met the requisite burden to justify the Court’s sealing or striking Exhibit 6 to the opposition brief. However, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2 requires redaction of individuals’ birth dates and the names of minors in electronic court filings. Therefore, the names and birth dates of Plaintiff Joyesh Raj and Defendant Kelly Raj’s minor children should be redacted. The Court will also require the redaction of Defendant Kelly Raj’s birth date.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** Defendant’s motion to strike or seal Exhibit 6. Plaintiffs are ordered to refile the exhibit with the minors’ names and birth dates of the children and Defendant redacted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 14, 2020

s/ *James S. Gwin*  
JAMES S. GWIN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 308 (citing [\*Baxter Int’l, Inc. v. Abbott Labs.\*, 297 F.3d 544, 546 \(7th Cir. 2002\)](#)).